

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

**DERRICK R BALL**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 070A-UI-10334-DWT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**OSCEOLA FOODS CORPORATION**  
Employer

**OC: 8/19/07 R: 03  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

871 IAC 26.8(5) – Decision on the Record

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Derrick R. Ball (claimant) appealed a representative's September 17, 2007 decision (reference 01) that disqualified him from receiving unemployment insurance benefits, and held the account of Osceola Foods Corporation (employer) was not subject to charge because the claimant had been discharged for disqualifying reasons. A telephone hearing was held before another administrative law judge on October 9, 2007. The claimant did not participate in the hearing. The employer appeared for the hearing. Based on the administrative record, that administrative law judge issued a decision on October 9 which again disqualified the claimant from receiving unemployment insurance benefits.

The claimant appealed the October 9 decision to the Employment Appeal Board. The claimant asserted the hearing notice had been sent to the wrong address and that he had provided his phone number in his appeal letter. The Employment Appeal Board remanded this matter to the Appeals Section for a new hearing.

After hearing notices were again mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on November 27, 2007. Judy Callahan and Tyson Crawford appeared on the employer's behalf. The claimant failed to respond to the hearing notice by contacting the Appeals Section prior to the hearing and providing the phone number at which he could be contacted to participate in the hearing. As a result, no one represented the claimant. Based on the administrative record and the law, the administrative law judge enters the following findings of fact, reasoning and conclusions of law, and decision.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

The parties were properly notified of the scheduled hearing on this appeal. The claimant failed to follow the hearing notice instructions by calling the Appeals Section after he received the hearing notice and providing the telephone number at which he could be reached for the hearing. The claimant did not participate in the hearing or request a postponement of the hearing as **required by the hearing notice**. (Emphasis supplied.)

The administrative law judge has conducted a careful review of the administrative file to determine whether the unemployment insurance decision should be affirmed.

**REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

871 IAC 26.8(3), (4) and (5) provide:

Withdrawals and postponements.

(3) If, due to emergency or other good cause, a party, having received due notice, is unable to attend a hearing or request postponement within the prescribed time, the presiding officer may, if no decision has been issued, reopen the record and, with notice to all parties, schedule another hearing. If a decision has been issued, the decision may be vacated upon the presiding officer's own motion or at the request of a party within 15 days after the mailing date of the decision and in the absence of an appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals. If a decision is vacated, notice shall be given to all parties of a new hearing to be held and decided by another presiding officer. Once a decision has become final as provided by statute, the presiding officer has no jurisdiction to reopen the record or vacate the decision.

(4) A request to reopen a record or vacate a decision may be heard ex parte by the presiding officer. The granting or denial of such a request may be used as a grounds for appeal to the employment appeal board of the department of inspections and appeals upon the issuance of the presiding officer's final decision in the case.

(5) If good cause for postponement or reopening has not been shown, the presiding officer shall make a decision based upon whatever evidence is properly in the record.

The administrative law judge has carefully reviewed evidence in the record and concludes that the unemployment insurance decision previously entered in this case is correct and should be affirmed.

Pursuant to the rule and Iowa Code § 17A.12-3, the claimant must make a written request to the administrative law judge that the hearing be reopened within 15 days after the mailing date of this decision. The written request should be mailed to the administrative law judge at the address listed at the beginning of this decision and must explain the emergency or other good cause that prevented the claimant from participating in the hearing at its scheduled time.

**DECISION:**

The representative's September 17, 2007 decision (reference 01) is affirmed. The decision disqualifying the claimant from receiving benefits as of August 19, 2007, remains in effect. This decision will become final unless a written request establishing good cause to reopen the record is made to the administrative law judge within 15 days of the date of this decision.

---

Debra L. Wise  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

dlw/kjw